arXiv:1511.08346v1 [quant-ph] 26 Nov 2015

Genuine Quantum Coherence

Alexander Streltsov*
ICFO – Institut de Ciències Fotòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels, Spain

The basis of any quantum resource theory are free states and free operations, these are states and operations which can be created or performed at no cost. In the resource theory of quantum coherence free states are states which are diagonal in a fixed reference basis. This choice is natural in many experimental scenarios where the reference basis is singled out by the unavoidable decoherence. The corresponding free operations are called incoherent, they can be implemented as a generalized measurement which does not create any coherence. However, a general quantum operation admits different experimental realizations, and a quantum operation which seems incoherent in one experimental realization might create coherence in another. Starting from this observation, we propose the framework of genuine quantum coherence. This approach is based on a simple principle: we demand that a genuinely incoherent operation preserves all incoherent states. This simple condition automatically guarantees that the operation is incoherent regardless of the particular experimental realization. Among other results we introduce and study the task of incoherent remote state preparation and compare our approach to the framework of quantum thermodynamics and the resource theory of asymmetry. Remarkably, we also show that the Hilbert-Schmidt distance to the set of incoherent states is a faithful measure of genuine coherence.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum coherence and entanglement are two fundamental manifestations of the quantum superposition principle. They became famous in the seminal Gedankenexperiment known as the Schrödinger's cat [1], and have led to extensive debates in the early days of quantum mechanics [2, 3]. While the existence of quantum coherence and entanglement is not doubted today [4], only few months ago the first loophole-free experiment detecting long-distance entanglement has been reported [5]. Entanglement is also regarded as a resource for new quantum technologies, such as quantum computers, which recently became commercially available [6].

The formulation of the resource theory of coherence goes back to Åberg's attempts to quantify superposition [7], and other approaches in this direction have been presented over the last years [8–13]. The idea that coherence can be seen as a resource in tasks based on the laws of quantum mechanics has found significant attention among many authors [14–28]. Finding appropriate measures of quantum coherence [29–39], and investigating their behavior in noisy processes [40–50] are two important research directions. Coherence has also been studied in the context of quantum thermodynamics [51–58], and detecting coherence in biological systems might reveal how living objects make use of quantum phenomena [59–62].

To set the stage for this paper, we recall the basic definitions of the resource theory of coherence as proposed Baumgratz *et al.* [13] and put forward by Winter and Yang [63]. The basis for this resource theory are incoherent operations $\Lambda_i[\rho] = \sum_l K_l \rho K_l^\dagger$, where K_l are incoherent Kraus operators such that $K_l |n\rangle \sim |f_{ln}\rangle$, and $|n\rangle$ and $|f_{ln}\rangle$ are incoherent states [13]. An example for such an incoherent operation is a single-qubit channel given by the following Kraus operators:

$$K_0 = |0\rangle\langle +| \quad \text{and} \quad K_1 = |1\rangle\langle -| \tag{1}$$

with $|\pm\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. These operators are incoherent as can be seen by noting that $K_i |\psi\rangle \sim |i\rangle$ holds true for any pure state $|\psi\rangle$. As we will see in the following, the channel defined in this way is not necessarily incoherent if other Kraus operator decompositions are considered. This can be seen by using the well known result from quantum information theory [64], saying that for a general quantum operation Λ there exist different sets of Kraus operators $\{K_i\}$ and $\{L_j\}$ such that $\Lambda[\rho] = \sum_i K_i \rho K_i^\dagger = \sum_j L_j \rho L_j^\dagger$. Without loss of generality we can assume that both sets have the same number of elements, and moreover any two such sets are related via $L_i = \sum_j V_{ij} K_j$, where V_{ij} are elements of a unitary matrix V. If we now apply this result to the channel defined above with $V = H/\sqrt{2}$ with the 2×2 Hadamard matrix H, we get the Kraus operators

$$L_\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle\langle +| \pm |1\rangle\langle -|\right). \tag{2}$$

Note that the Kraus operators $L_\pm$ are not incoherent, which can be directly checked by applying them to the state $|0\rangle$: $L_\pm |0\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/2$. Thus, these Kraus operators convert the incoherent state $|0\rangle$ into one of the maximally coherent states $|+\rangle$ or $|-\rangle$.

The above example shows that a quantum operation which is incoherent in one Kraus decomposition is not necessarily incoherent in another Kraus decomposition. This observation per se does not diminish the value of incoherent operations: indeed, a similar effect appears also in entanglement theory. There, the set of local operations and classical communication (LOCC) is also defined via

* streltsov.physics@gmail.com

a certain structure of Kraus operators which is lost when other Kraus decompositions are considered.

However, while the structure of LOCC operations is naturally given by the tensor-product structure of the system under study, there is no obvious rule to follow in the resource theory of coherence. For this reason, we will introduce the set of genuinely incoherent operations in the following. This new set is derived from one simple condition, namely that the operation preserves *all* incoherent states. We will show in this work that these operations are incoherent with respect to *any* Kraus decomposition, and exhibiting several desirable properties which are not present for the set introduced in [13].

II. GENUINELY INCOHERENT OPERATIONS

We define genuinely incoherent operations to be quantum operations which preserve incoherent states:

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\rho_i] = \rho_i \tag{3}$$

for any incoherent state ρ_i. The following theorem provides an important property of any genuinely incoherent operation.

Theorem 1. *All Kraus operators of a genuinely incoherent operation are diagonal in the incoherent basis.*

We refer to the appendix for the proof. This theorem also implies that the set of genuinely incoherent operations is a strict subset of incoherent operations introduced by Baumgratz *et al*. [13].

An example for a genuinely incoherent operation is a convex combination of unitaries diagonal in the incoherent basis:

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\rho] = \sum_k p_k U_k \rho U_k^\dagger \tag{4}$$

with probabilities p_k and unitaries U_k defines as $U_k = \sum_l e^{i\phi_{lk}} |l\rangle\langle l|$. It is now natural to ask if any genuinely incoherent operation can be written in this form. The following theorem provides an affirmative answer in the single-qubit case.

Theorem 2. *Any genuinely incoherent operation Λ_{gi} for a single qubit is given by Eq. (4).*

For the proof of the theorem we refer to the appendix. For dimensions larger than two it remains unclear if all genuinely incoherent operations have the form of Eq. (4).

III. RELATION TO THERMAL AND TRANSLATIONALLY INVARIANT OPERATIONS

Given a system S with Hamiltonian H_S and an environment E with Hamiltonian H_E, a thermal operation Λ_{th} on a state of the system ρ^S is given by [53, 54, 65–68]

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{th}}\left[\rho^S\right] = \mathrm{Tr}_E\left[U\rho^S \otimes \tau^E U^\dagger\right]. \tag{5}$$

The unitary U can be arbitrary up to the requirement that it preserves the total energy, and thus commutes with the total (noninteracting) Hamiltonian $H_{SE} = H_S + H_E$ of the system and environment. The state τ^E is a thermal state of the environment: $\tau^E = e^{-\beta H_E}/\mathrm{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_E}]$ with an inverse temperature $\beta = 1/T$.

We call a thermal operation nondegenerate if the total Hamiltonian H_{SE} is nondegenerate. In this case we can prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *The set of nondegenerate thermal operations is a subset of genuinely incoherent operations.*

We refer to the appendix for the proof.

In the next step, we will discuss the relation of our approach to translationally invariant operations, which appear in the resource theory of asymmetry [11, 12, 69]. A translationally invariant operation Λ_{ti} with respect to a Hamiltonian H is defined by the relation [9, 69, 70]

$$e^{-iHt}\Lambda_{\mathrm{ti}}[\rho]e^{iHt} = \Lambda_{\mathrm{ti}}\left[e^{-iHt}\rho e^{iHt}\right] \tag{6}$$

for any state ρ. In our context, it is natural to define the Hamiltonian H to be diagonal in the incoherent basis. We now have the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *The set of genuinely incoherent operations is a strict subset of translationally invariant operations.*

The proof can be found in the appendix.

Using the above results we can now formulate inclusion relations between the set of nondegenerate thermal operations NTO, genuinely incoherent operations GIO, translationally invariant operations TIO and incoherent operations IO:

$$\mathrm{NTO} \subseteq \mathrm{GIO} \subset \mathrm{TIO} \subset \mathrm{IO}. \tag{7}$$

While the first three inclusions follow from the above arguments, the last inclusion was proven in [70].

IV. QUANTIFYING GENUINE COHERENCE

Having introduced the framework of genuine coherence, we will provide methods to quantify the amount of genuine coherence in a given state. For this, we will follow established notions for entanglement and coherence quantifiers [4, 13, 71, 72].

A measure of genuine coherence G should have at least the following two properties.

G1 Nonnegativity: G is nonnegative, and zero if and only if the state ρ is incoherent.

G2 Monotonicity: G does not increase under genuinely incoherent operations, $G(\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\rho]) \leq G(\rho)$.

It is instrumental to compare the above conditions to the corresponding conditions in entanglement theory [4, 71, 72]. There, the condition corresponding to G2 implies that an entanglement measure does not increase under LOCC. This condition and nonnegativity are regarded as the most fundamental conditions for an entanglement measure [4].

The following two conditions will be regarded as desirable but less fundamental.

G2′ Strong monotonicity: G does not increase on average under the action of genuinely incoherent operations for any set of Kraus operators $\{K_i\}$, i.e., $\sum_i q_i G(\sigma_i) \leq G(\rho)$ with probabilities $q_i = \mathrm{Tr}[K_i \rho K_i^\dagger]$ and states $\sigma_i = K_i \rho K_i^\dagger / q_i$.

G3 Convexity: G is a convex function of the state, $G(\sum_i p_i \rho_i) \leq \sum_i p_i G(\rho_i)$.

The entanglement equivalent of G2′ states that the entanglement measure does not increase on average under selective LOCC. This condition as well as convexity are not mandatory for a good entanglement measure [4]. Following the notion from entanglement theory, we will consider conditions G1 and G2 to be more fundamental than G2′ and G3. A measure which fulfills conditions G1, G2, and G2′ will be called *genuine coherence monotone*. Additionally, the corresponding measure (monotone) will be called *convex* if condition G3 is fulfilled as well. Note that G2′ and G3 in combination imply G2.

Since the set of genuinely incoherent operations is a subset of general incoherent operations, any coherence monotone in the sense of Baumgratz *et al*. is also a genuine coherence monotone. Examples for such monotones are the relative entropy of coherence, the l_1-norm of coherence, and the geometric coherence [13, 31]. However, it is possible that some quantities which do not give rise to a good coherence measure in the framework of Baumgratz *et al*. are still good measures of genuine coherence. This is indeed the case for the Wigner-Yanase skew information [73]: $S_H(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}([H, \sqrt{\rho}]^2)$ with the commutator $[X, Y] = XY - YX$, and H is some nondegenerate Hermitian operator diagonal in the incoherent basis. As is shown in the appendix, S_H is a convex measure of genuine coherence, it fulfills conditions G1, G2, and G3. It remains open if it also fulfills the condition G2′.

Alternatively, a very general measure of genuine coherence can be defined as follows:

$$G_D(\rho) = \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{I}} D(\rho, \sigma), \tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is the set of incoherent states and D is an arbitrary distance which does not increase under unital operations Λ_u, i.e., $D(\Lambda_\mathrm{u}[\rho], \Lambda_\mathrm{u}[\sigma]) \leq D(\rho, \sigma)$ for any operation which preserves the maximally mixed state $\Lambda_\mathrm{u}(\mathbb{1}/d) = \mathbb{1}/d$. The following theorem shows that G_D fulfills the corresponding conditions.

Theorem 5. *G_D is a measure of genuine coherence, it satisfies conditions G1 and G2. If D is jointly convex, G_D also satisfies G3.*

The proof can be found in the appendix.

An example for such a distance is the quantum relative entropy $S(\rho\|\sigma) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho \log_2 \rho] - \mathrm{Tr}[\rho \log_2 \sigma]$, and the corresponding measure is known as the relative entropy of coherence [13]. As mentioned above, this measure also satisfies strong monotonicity G2′ [13].

Remarkably, Theorem 5 also holds for all distances based on Schatten p-norms $D(\rho, \sigma) = \|\rho - \sigma\|_p$ with the Schatten p-norm $\|M\|_p = (\mathrm{Tr}[(M^\dagger M)^{p/2}])^{1/p}$ and $p \geq 1$. This follows from the fact that Schatten p-norms do not increase under unital operations [74]. This result is surprising since Schatten p-norms are generally problematic in quantum information theory. In particular, the attempt to quantify entanglement via these norms leads to quantities which can increase under local operations for $p > 1$ [75, 76]. Similar problems arise for other types of quantum correlations such as quantum discord [77, 78].

For $p = 1$ and $p = 2$ the corresponding distances are also known as trace distance and Hilbert-Schmidt distance. In the case of the Hilbert-Schmidt distance the coherence measure can be evaluated explicitly [13]: $C_\mathrm{HS}(\rho) = \left\|\rho - \Delta[\rho]\right\|_2$, where $\Delta[\rho] = \sum_i \langle i|\rho|i\rangle\, |i\rangle\langle i|$ denotes complete dephasing in the incoherent basis. However, for general Schatten norms $\Delta[\rho]$ is not the closest incoherent state to ρ [13].

While the distance-based measure of coherence defined in Eq. (8) does not admit a closed expression for a general distance D, it is proven in the appendix that the following simple quantity is also a valid measure of coherence:

$$\tilde{G}_D(\rho) = D(\rho, \Delta[\rho]). \tag{9}$$

In particular, $\tilde{G}_D$ satisfies conditions G1 and G2 if the distance D is is contractive under unital operations. Additionally, $\tilde{G}_D$ is convex if the distance D is jointly convex. This is true for all distances based on Schatten p-norms [13]. It remains unclear if these measures are also genuine coherence monotones, i.e., if they satisfy G2′ [79].

V. PURE STATE TRANSFORMATIONS

In the resource theory of entanglement, the maximally entangled two-qubit state is considered as a golden unit, since any two-qubit state can be created from it via LOCC operations [4]. Similarly, in the resource theory of coherence introduced by Baumgratz *et al*. the golden unit is the maximally coherent single-qubit state $|+\rangle$, from which any single-qubit state can be created via incoherent operations [13].

In this context, it is natural to ask if every single-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$ can be created from $|+\rangle$ via genuinely incoherent operations. The answer to this question is provided in the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Given a single-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$ with $|\langle\psi|0\rangle|^2 \neq 1/2$, there is no genuinely incoherent operation which deterministically creates this state from the state $|+\rangle$.*

The proof of the theorem can be found in the appendix. This theorem is also in accordance with the results of Lostaglio *et al*. [54], who showed limitations on the amount of states accessible via thermal operations.

While the above theorem shows that the state $|+\rangle$ in general cannot be deterministically transformed into another state $|\psi\rangle$ in our framework, there is still the possibility for stochastic state transformations. In particular, any genuinely incoherent operation $\Lambda_{\rm gi}[\rho] = \sum_i K_i \rho K_i^\dagger$ can be regarded as a measurement where outcomes i occur with probability $p_i = {\rm Tr}[K_i \rho K_i^\dagger]$, and the post-measurement state is given by $K_i \rho K_i^\dagger / p_i$. The following theorem shows the state $|+\rangle$ can be stochastically transformed into any other state.

Theorem 7. *Any orthogonal pair of single-qubit states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ can be stochastically prepared from $|+\rangle$ via genuinely incoherent operations.*

We refer to the appendix for the proof. Remarkably, in this stochastic procedure each of the states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ appears with equal probability: $p_\psi = p_{\psi^\perp} = 1/2$.

VI. INCOHERENT REMOTE STATE PREPARATION

We will now compare the two frameworks of coherence discussed here on the task of remote state preparation [80]. In this task, two parties, Alice and Bob, share a singlet state $|\psi^-\rangle = (|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The aim of the process is to remotely prepare Bob's system in the state $|\psi\rangle = (|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ via local operations and classical communication. For this, Alice needs to perform a von Neumann measurement in the basis $\{|\psi_\perp\rangle\langle\psi_\perp|, |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\}$ on her part of the singlet, where the state $|\psi_\perp\rangle = (|0\rangle - e^{i\phi}|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ is orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$. Depending on the outcome of Alice, Bob either finds his system in the state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ or $|\psi_\perp\rangle\langle\psi_\perp|$. In the latter case, he can perform a σ_z rotation, and thus deterministically prepare the desired state $|\psi\rangle$.

To relate this task to the framework of coherence, we will consider the set of local incoherent operations and classical communication (LICC). This set was introduced in [81–83], it is the same as LOCC up to the fact that Alice and Bob are restricted to local incoherent operations only. Apart from this, we introduce ***L**ocal **G**enuinely **I**ncoherent operations and **C**lassical **C**ommunication (LGICC)*, which is obtained by restricting Alice and Bob to local genuinely incoherent operations.

It is now natural to ask how the performance of remote state preparation changes if the set of LOCC is replaced by LICC or LGICC. The answer is provided in the following theorem. In particular, we are interested in deterministic remote state preparation, i.e., where the desired state is prepared with certainty.

Theorem 8. *Deterministic remote state preparation is possible with LICC but impossible with LGICC.*

For the proof we refer to the appendix.

This theorem clearly demonstrates a tradeoff between the framework of genuine coherence introduced here and the framework of coherence considered by Baumgratz *et al*. [13]. It turns out that the incoherent operations as introduced in [13] are very powerful: indeed they not only allow for perfect remote state preparation, but also for perfect teleportation [82]. The above theorem shows that genuinely incoherent operations have strictly less power. This property might have important implications, in particular if one is interested in quantum technological tasks where coherence plays the essential role.

VII. RELATION TO ENTANGLEMENT THEORY OF MAXIMALLY CORRELATED STATES

Recently, several authors conjectured [31, 63, 81] that the resource theory of coherence as introduced by Baumgratz *et al*. is equivalent to the resource theory of entanglement, if the latter is restricted to the set of maximally correlated states. Given a state $\rho = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j|$, we can always associate with it a bipartite maximally correlated state $\rho_{\rm mc} = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj|$. This connection has led to several important results, e.g., the distillable coherence, the coherence cost, and the coherence of assistance of ρ are all equal to the corresponding entanglement equivalent of $\rho_{\rm mc}$ [63, 81]. Moreover, it has been conjectured [81] that for any two states ρ and σ related via some incoherent operation $\Lambda_{\rm i}$ such that $\sigma = \Lambda_{\rm i}[\rho]$, the maximally correlated states $\rho_{\rm mc}$ and $\sigma_{\rm mc}$ are related via some LOCC operation: $\sigma_{\rm mc} = \Lambda_{\rm LOCC}[\rho_{\rm mc}]$. As we will see in the following theorem, this conjecture is true if genuinely incoherent operations are considered.

Theorem 9. *Given two states ρ and σ related via a genuinely incoherent operation such that $\sigma = \Lambda_{\rm gi}[\rho]$, there always exists an LOCC operation relating the corresponding maximally correlated states: $\sigma_{\rm mc} = \Lambda_{\rm LOCC}[\rho_{\rm mc}]$.*

We refer to the appendix for the proof.

This theorem lifts the relation between coherence and entanglement to a new level. For an arbitrary coherence-based task involving genuinely incoherent operations, we can immediately make statements about the corresponding entanglement-based task involving LOCC operations. For a full equivalence between the theory of genuine coherence and the theory of entanglement of maximally correlated states one still needs to answer the following question: given two maximally correlated states $\rho_{\rm mc}$ and $\sigma_{\rm mc}$ related via some LOCC operation such that $\sigma_{\rm mc} = \Lambda_{\rm LOCC}[\rho_{\rm mc}]$, is there always a (genuinely) incoherent operation such that $\sigma = \Lambda_{\rm gi}[\rho]$? We leave this question open for future research.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we introduced the framework of genuine quantum coherence. This framework can be reduced to one simple requirement: that the genuinely incoherent quantum operation preserves all incoherent states. We have seen that quantum operations obtained in this way are incoherent for any Kraus decomposition, i.e., they cannot produce coherence regardless of their particular experimental implementation. Among a variety of results we have studied the relation of our approach to quantum thermodynamics and to the resource theory of asymmetry, proposed ways to quantify genuine coherence, and introduced the task of incoherent remote state preparation.

The results presented in this work lead to several open questions which should be addressed in future work. One such open question is about the equivalence between the resource theory of genuine coherence and the resource theory of entanglement of maximally correlated state. In this work we have shown that this equivalence is likely to hold for the framework presented here, while it is still unclear if it holds for the approach proposed by Baumgratz *et al.* However, further work is required to prove full equivalence.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Gerardo Adesso, Manabendra Nath Bera, Swapan Rana, and Andreas Winter for inspiring discussion and support. This work was financially supported by the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation, the John Templeton Foundation, the EU IP SIQS, the EU Grant QUIC, the European Research Council (ERC AdG OSYRIS), the Generalitat de Catalunya project 2014 SGR 874, and the Spanish MINECO (FOQUS FIS2013-46768 and Severo Ochoa grant SEV-2015-0522).

APPENDIX

In this appendix we will prove all theorems of the main text. Before we start, we recall the basic definition of a genuinely incoherent operation:

$$\Lambda_{\rm gi}[\rho_{\rm i}] = \rho_{\rm i} \tag{A.1}$$

for any incoherent state $\rho_{\rm i}$.

1. Proof of Theorem 1

Here we will show that all Kraus operators of a genuinely incoherent operations are diagonal in the incoherent basis. For this, we consider its application to an incoherent pure state:

$$\Lambda_{\rm gi}\left[|j\rangle\langle j|\right] = \sum_i K_i |j\rangle\langle j| K_i^\dagger = |j\rangle\langle j|\,, \tag{A.2}$$

where K_i are Kraus operators, and the last equality follows from the definition of $\Lambda_{\rm gi}$. This equality can only hold true if $|j\rangle$ is an eigenstate of every Kraus operator:

$$K_i|j\rangle \sim |j\rangle\,. \tag{A.3}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

2. Proof of Theorem 2

Here we will prove that any genuinely incoherent operation for a single qubit can be written as

$$\Lambda_{\rm gi}[\rho] = \sum_k p_k U_k \rho U_k^\dagger \tag{A.4}$$

with unitaries $U_k = \sum e^{i\phi_{lk}}|l\rangle\langle l|$.

Since any genuinely incoherent operation preserves all incoherent states, it must also preserve the maximally mixed state $\mathbb{1}/2$. This means that the single-qubit operation is unital. Note that every unital single-qubit operation can be written as [64]

$$\Lambda_{\rm u}[\rho] = \sum_k p_k U_k \rho U_k^\dagger \tag{A.5}$$

with some unitaries U_k. The proof is complete by recalling that all Kraus operators of $\Lambda_{\rm gi}$ are diagonal in the incoherent basis, and thus it must be that $U_k = \sum_l e^{i\phi_{kl}}|l\rangle\langle l|$.

3. Proof of Theorem 3

Here we will prove that the set of nondegenerate thermal operations is a subset of genuinely incoherent operations.

We start with the definition of a thermal operation

$$\Lambda_{\rm th}\left[\rho^S\right] = {\rm Tr}_E\left[U\rho^S\otimes\tau^E U^\dagger\right]. \tag{A.6}$$

The requirements that the total Hamiltonian $H_{SE} = H_S + H_E$ is nondegenerate and commutes with the unitary U implies that they share the same product basis states $|l\rangle|k\rangle$. This means that the unitary U can be written as

$$U = \sum_{l,k} e^{i\phi_{lk}}|l\rangle\langle l|^S\otimes|k\rangle\langle k|^E\,. \tag{A.7}$$

This expression can be also written as $U = \sum_k U_k^S\otimes|k\rangle\langle k|^E$ with the unitaries $U_k^S = \sum_l e^{i\phi_{lk}}|l\rangle\langle l|^S$. If we now apply Eq. (A.6) and recall that $\tau^E = e^{-\beta H_E}/{\rm Tr}[e^{-\beta H_E}]$, it follows that the thermal operation takes the form

$$\Lambda\left[\rho\right] = \sum_k p_k U_k \rho U_k^\dagger \tag{A.8}$$

with the probabilities $p_k = e^{-\beta E_k}/(\sum_l e^{-\beta E_l})$, where E_k are the eigenvalues of H_E. Since any quantum operation of the form (A.8) is genuinely incoherent, the proof of the theorem is complete.

4. Proof of Theorem 4

Here we will prove that the set of genuinely incoherent operations is a strict subset of translationally invariant operations. The latter are defined as

$$e^{-iHt}\Lambda_{\mathrm{ti}}[\rho]e^{iHt} = \Lambda_{\mathrm{ti}}\left[e^{-iHt}\rho e^{iHt}\right] \tag{A.9}$$

for any quantum state ρ, and we only consider Hamiltonians H which are diagonal in the incoherent basis.

For proving the theorem, recall that all genuinely incoherent Kraus operators are diagonal in the incoherent basis. This means that all Kraus operators commute with the Hamiltonian:

$$[K_i, H] = 0. \tag{A.10}$$

By expressing a genuinely incoherent operation as $\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\rho] = \sum_i K_i \rho K_i^\dagger$ and using Eq. (A.10), we can immediately verify that Λ_{gi} satisfies Eq. (A.9). Thus, every genuinely incoherent operation must be translationally invariant.

To prove that a translationally invariant operation is in general not genuinely incoherent, note that the erasing operation $\Lambda[\rho] = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ is translationally invariant, but it violates Eq. (A.1).

5. Proof of Theorem 5

Here we will prove that

$$G_D(\rho) = \min_{\sigma\in\mathcal{I}} D(\rho,\sigma) \tag{A.11}$$

is a measure of genuine coherence if the distance D does not increase under unital operations:

$$D(\Lambda_{\mathrm{u}}[\rho], \Lambda_{\mathrm{u}}[\sigma]) \leq D(\rho,\sigma), \tag{A.12}$$

for any unital operation Λ_{u}, i.e., $\Lambda_{\mathrm{u}}(\mathbb{1}/d) = \mathbb{1}/d$. In particular, we will show that G_D satisfies conditions G1 and G2.

The proof of G1 follows from the fact that any distance is nonnegative and zero if and only if $\rho = \sigma$. For proving G2, let τ be the closest incoherent state to ρ, i.e., $G_D(\rho) = D(\rho,\tau)$. The fact that any genuinely incoherent operation is unital together with the requirement that D does not increase under unital maps implies:

$$G_D(\rho) = D(\rho,\tau) \geq D\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\rho], \Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\tau]\right) \geq G_D\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\rho]\right), \tag{A.13}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that $\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\tau]$ is incoherent.

We will now show that G_D is also convex if the distance D is jointly convex, i.e., if it satisfies

$$D\left(\sum_i p_i\rho_i, \sum_j p_j\sigma_j\right) \leq \sum_i p_i D(\rho_i,\sigma_i). \tag{A.14}$$

For this, let τ_i be the closest incoherent state to ρ_i: $G_D(\rho_i) = D(\rho_i,\tau_i)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i p_i G_D(\rho_i) = \sum_i p_i D(\rho_i,\tau_i) &\geq D\left(\sum_i p_i\rho_i, \sum_j p_j\tau_i\right)\\ &\geq G_D\left(\sum_i p_i\rho_i\right),\end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

which is the desired statement.

6. Proof of Theorem 6

Here we will prove that for any single-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$ such that

$$|\langle\psi|0\rangle|^2 \neq 1/2 \tag{A.16}$$

there is no genuinely incoherent operation which deterministically transforms $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ into $|\psi\rangle$.

We start by recalling that any pure single-qubit state can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle \tag{A.17}$$

with arbitrary complex coefficients a and b such that $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$. If a perfect transformation from $|+\rangle$ to $|\psi\rangle$ was possible, there would exists a set of genuinely incoherent Kraus operators $\{K_i\}$ such that

$$K_i|+\rangle = \lambda_i|\psi\rangle, \tag{A.18}$$

with some complex coefficients λ_i such that $\sum_i |\lambda_i|^2 = 1$. This equality together with the fact that K_i are genuinely incoherent (i.e. $K_i|0\rangle \sim |0\rangle$ and $K_i|1\rangle \sim |1\rangle$) leads us to the following set of equations:

$$K_i|0\rangle = a\lambda_i\sqrt{2}|0\rangle, \tag{A.19a}$$

$$K_i|1\rangle = b\lambda_i\sqrt{2}|1\rangle. \tag{A.19b}$$

Now, since the Kraus operators must fulfill the completeness equation $\sum_i K_i^\dagger K_i = \mathbb{1}$, it follows that $\sum_i \langle j|K_i^\dagger K_i|j\rangle = 1$. On the other hand, from Eq. (A.19) we have:

$$\sum_i \langle 0|K_i^\dagger K_i|0\rangle = 2|a|^2, \tag{A.20a}$$

$$\sum_i \langle 1|K_i^\dagger K_i|1\rangle = 2|b|^2, \tag{A.20b}$$

where we have used the equality $\sum_i |\lambda_i|^2 = 1$. This set of equations is only compatible with the above results if $|a|^2 = |b|^2 = 1/2$. This means that for $|a| \neq |b|$ there is no deterministic genuinely incoherent protocol which transforms the state $|+\rangle$ into $|\psi\rangle$.

7. Proof of Theorem 7

Here we will show that any orthogonal pair of single-qubit states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ can be stochastically prepared from $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ via genuinely incoherent operations.

A genuinely incoherent single-qubit operation which allows for the desired transformation is given by $\Lambda_{\rm gi}[\rho] = \sum_{i=0}^{1} K_i \rho K_i^\dagger$ with two Kraus operators

$$K_0 = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}}\mathbb{1} + \frac{d}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_z, \tag{A.21}$$

$$K_1 = \frac{d^*}{\sqrt{2}}\mathbb{1} - \frac{c^*}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_z, \tag{A.22}$$

and arbitrary complex numbers c and d such that $|c|^2 + |d|^2 = 1$. As can be verified by inspection, these operators fulfill $\sum_i K_i^\dagger K_i = \mathbb{1}$ and $K_i |j\rangle \sim |j\rangle$, which implies that they indeed give rise to a genuinely incoherent operation. Noting that σ_z transforms the state $|+\rangle$ into $|-\rangle$, we get the following relations:

$$K_0 |+\rangle = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}} |+\rangle + \frac{d}{\sqrt{2}} |-\rangle , \tag{A.23}$$

$$K_1 |+\rangle = \frac{d^*}{\sqrt{2}} |+\rangle - \frac{c^*}{\sqrt{2}} |-\rangle . \tag{A.24}$$

Note that both unnormalized vectors $K_0 |+\rangle$ and $K_1 |+\rangle$ are mutually orthogonal and have the same norm: $\langle +|K_i^\dagger K_j|+\rangle = 1/2\delta_{ij}$. Since any single-qubit state can be written as $|\psi\rangle = c|+\rangle + d|-\rangle$ these results mean that a single-qubit genuinely incoherent operation can stochastically transform the maximally coherent state $|+\rangle$ into an arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle$ with probability 1/2. With the same probability, one obtains an orthogonal state $|\psi^\perp\rangle$.

8. Proof of Theorem 8

Here we will prove that deterministic remote state preparation is possible with LICC but not possible with LGICC.

First, we will prove that the process is possible with LICC. For this, it is enough to replace Alice's von Neumann measurement in the standard remote state preparation protocol by an incoherent measurement with Kraus operators $K_0 = |0\rangle\langle\psi_\perp|$ and $K_1 = |0\rangle\langle\psi|$. Clearly, this operation is incoherent in the sense of Baumgratz *et al*. [13], and it can be verified by inspection that it leads to the same post-measurement state of Bob as the original von Neumann measurement in the basis $\{|\psi_\perp\rangle\langle\psi_\perp|, |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\}$. Since the final conditional σ_z rotation on Bob's side is also incoherent, this proves that deterministic remote state preparation is possible with LICC.

We will now prove that the process is not possible with LGICC. For this, recall that genuinely incoherent Kraus operators are all diagonal in the incoherent basis. Thus, for any local genuinely incoherent Kraus operator K_i^A the unnormalized vector $K_i^A |\psi^-\rangle$ takes the following form:

$$K_i^A |\psi^-\rangle = a|01\rangle - b|10\rangle \tag{A.25}$$

with some complex coefficients a and b. This means that Bob's post-measurement state is always diagonal in the incoherent basis and thus incoherent. Since the desired state $|\psi\rangle = (|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ is highly coherent, this proves that deterministic remote state preparation is not possible with LGICC.

9. Proof of Theorem 9

Here we will prove that for any two states ρ and σ related via a genuinely incoherent operation $\Lambda_{\rm gi}$ such that

$$\sigma = \Lambda_{\rm gi}[\rho], \tag{A.26}$$

there always exists an LOCC operation such that

$$\sigma_{\rm mc} = \Lambda_{\rm LOCC}[\rho_{\rm mc}]. \tag{A.27}$$

We will prove this statement by showing that $\Lambda_{\rm LOCC}$ can be chosen as $\Lambda_{\rm gi}^A$, i.e., the genuinely incoherent operation acting on Alice's subsystem. For this, we first write σ explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma = \Lambda_{\rm gi}[\rho] &= \sum_i K_i \rho K_i^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{i,m,l} \rho_{ml} K_i |m\rangle\langle l| K_i^\dagger = \sum_{\rm i,m,l} \rho_{\rm ml} {\rm a_{im} a_{il}^*} |{\rm m}\rangle\langle {\rm l}|\end{aligned} \tag{A.28}$$

with $\rho = \sum_{m,l} \rho_{ml} |m\rangle\langle l|$ and $K_i |m\rangle = a_{im} |m\rangle$.

We will no apply the same operation $\Lambda_{\rm gi}$ on Alice's subsystem of the maximally correlated state $\rho_{\rm mc} = \sum_{m,l} \rho_{ml} |mm\rangle\langle ll|$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{\rm gi}^A[\rho_{\rm mc}] &= \sum_{i,m,l} \rho_{ml} K_i |m\rangle\langle l| K_i^\dagger \otimes |m\rangle\langle l| \\ &= \sum_{i,m,l} \rho_{ml} a_{im} a_{il}^* |mm\rangle\langle ll| = \sigma_{\rm mc}.\end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

10. Wigner-Yanase skew information

is a convex measure of coherence

Here we will prove that the Wigner-Yanase skew information

$$S_H(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\left[H, \sqrt{\rho}\right]^2\right) \tag{A.30}$$

is a convex measure of coherence, i.e., it satisfies G1, G2, and G3 if the Hermitian operator H is nondegenerate and diagonal in the incoherent basis.

The Wigner-Yanase skew information fulfills G1 since it is nonnegative and zero if and only if the commutator $[H, \sqrt{\rho}]$ vanishes. For a nondegenerate Hermitian operator H the commutator $[H, \sqrt{\rho}]$ vanishes if and only if ρ and H are diagonal in the same basis, which proves condition G1. Condition G2 follows from the facts that the Wigner-Yanase skew information does not increase under translationally invariant operations [70] and that any genuinely incoherent operation is translationally invariant with respect to a Hamiltonian H diagonal in the incoherent basis, see Theorem 4. Since the Wigner-Yanase skew information is convex [73], G3 is also fulfilled.

11. Computable measure of genuine coherence

Here we will show that

$$\tilde{G}_D(\rho) = D(\rho, \Delta[\rho]) \tag{A.31}$$

is a measure of coherence, i.e., it satisfies conditions G1 and G2 for any distance D which is nonincreasing under unital operations, and

$$\Delta[\rho] = \sum_i \langle i|\rho|i\rangle\, |i\rangle\langle i|\,. \tag{A.32}$$

Condition G1 follows from the fact that the distance $D(\rho, \Delta[\rho])$ is nonnegative and zero if and only if $\rho = \Delta[\rho]$. For condition G2, recall that all Kraus operators of a genuinely incoherent operation are diagonal in the incoherent basis, and thus any genuinely incoherent operation commutes with the dephasing operation Δ:

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}\left[\Delta\left[\rho\right]\right] = \Delta\left[\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}\left[\rho\right]\right]. \tag{A.33}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{G}_D\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}[\rho]\right) &= D\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}\left[\rho\right], \Delta\left[\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}\left[\rho\right]\right]\right) \\ &= D\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}\left[\rho\right], \Lambda_{\mathrm{gi}}\left[\Delta\left[\rho\right]\right]\right) \\ &\leq D\left(\rho, \Delta[\rho]\right) = \tilde{G}_D(\rho),\end{aligned} \tag{A.34}$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that Λ_{gi} is unital.

We will now prove that $\tilde{G}_D$ is also convex if the distance D is jointly convex. This can be proven directly via the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i p_i \tilde{G}_D(\rho_i) &= \sum_i p_i D(\rho_i, \Delta[\rho_i]) \geq D\left(\sum_i p_i\rho_i, \sum_j p_j \Delta[\rho_j]\right) \\ &= D\left(\sum_i p_i\rho_i, \Delta\left[\sum_j p_j\rho_j\right]\right) = \tilde{G}_D\left(\sum_i p_i\rho_i\right).\end{aligned} \tag{A.35}$$

This completes the proof.

[1] E. Schrödinger, Naturwissenschaften **23**, 807 (1935); Naturwissenschaften **23**, 823 (1935); Naturwissenschaften **23**, 844 (1935).
[2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
[3] N. Bohr, Phys. Rev. **48**, 696 (1935).
[4] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[5] B. Hensen, H. Bernien, A. E. Dréau, A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, M. S. Blok, J. Ruitenberg, R. F. L. Vermeulen, R. N. Schouten, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, M. W. Mitchell, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, D. Elkouss, S. Wehner, T. H. Taminiau, and R. Hanson, (2015), arXiv:1508.05949v1.
[6] S. Boixo, T. F. Rønnow, S. V. Isakov, Z. Wang, D. Wecker, D. A. Lidar, J. M. Martinis, and M. Troyer, Nature Physics **10**, 218 (2014).
[7] J. Aberg, (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0612146.
[8] G. Gour and R. W. Spekkens, New J. Phys. **10**, 033023 (2008).
[9] G. Gour, I. Marvian, and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012307 (2009).
[10] F. Levi and F. Mintert, New J. Phys. **16**, 033007 (2014).
[11] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens, New J. Phys. **15**, 033001 (2013).
[12] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 062110 (2014).
[13] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
[14] J.-J. Chen, J. Cui, and H. Fan, (2015), arXiv:1509.03576v1.
[15] S. Cheng and M. J. W. Hall, (2015), arXiv:1508.03240.
[16] X. Hu and H. Fan, (2015), arXiv:1508.01978.
[17] D. Mondal, C. Datta, and S. Sazim, (2015), arXiv:1506.03199.
[18] P. Deb, (2015), arXiv:1505.04682v2.
[19] S. Du, Z. Bai, and Y. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052120 (2015).
[20] Z. Bai and S. Du, (2015), arXiv:1503.07103.
[21] M. N. Bera, T. Qureshi, M. A. Siddiqui, and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 012118 (2015).
[22] X. Liu, Z. Tian, J. Wang, and J. Jing, (2015),

arXiv:1509.06832v1.
[23] Z. Xi, Y. Li, and H. Fan, Scientific Reports **5**, 10922 (2015).
[24] H. Li, J. Zou, W.-L. Yu, B.-M. Xu, J.-G. Li, and B. Shao, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 052132 (2014).
[25] K. von Prillwitz, Ł. Rudnicki, and F. Mintert, (2014), arXiv:1409.1814.
[26] G. Karpat, B. Çakmak, and F. F. Fanchini, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 104431 (2014).
[27] B. Çakmak, G. Karpat, and F. F. Fanchini, Entropy **17**, 790 (2015).
[28] S. Du, Z. Bai, and X. Qi, (2015), arXiv:1504.02862v1.
[29] D. Girolami, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 170401 (2014).
[30] S. Du and Z. Bai, (2015), arXiv:1505.00151v1.
[31] A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020403 (2015).
[32] N. Killoran, F. E. S. Steinhoff, and M. B. Plenio, (2015), arXiv:1505.07393.
[33] D. Girolami and B. Yadin, (2015), arXiv:1509.04131.
[34] X. Yuan, H. Zhou, Z. Cao, and X. Ma, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022124 (2015).
[35] Y. Yao, X. Xiao, L. Ge, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022112 (2015).
[36] X. Qi, Z. Bai, and S. Du, (2015), arXiv:1505.07387.
[37] J. Xu, arXiv:1510.02916.
[38] B. Yadin and V. Vedral, (2015), arXiv:1505.03792.
[39] S. Rana, P. Parashar, and M. Lewenstein, (2015), arXiv:1511.01854.
[40] T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 210401 (2015).
[41] U. Singh, M. Nath Bera, A. Misra, and A. K. Pati, (2015), arXiv:1506.08186.
[42] A. Mani and V. Karimipour, (2015), arXiv:1506.02304.
[43] U. Singh, M. N. Bera, H. S. Dhar, and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052115 (2015).
[44] T. Chanda and S. Bhattacharya, (2015), arXiv:1505.05810.
[45] K. Bu, L. Zhang, and J. Wu, (2015), arXiv:1509.09109.
[46] U. Singh, L. Zhang, and A. K. Pati, (2015), arXiv:1509.08939.
[47] Y.-J. Zhang, W. Han, Y.-J. Xia, Y.-M. Yu, and H. Fan, (2015), arXiv:1502.02446.
[48] M. Allegra, P. Giorda, and S. Lloyd, (2015), arXiv:1503.04735.
[49] M. García-Díaz, D. Egloff, and M. B. Plenio, (2015), arXiv:1510.06683.
[50] I. A. Silva, A. M. Souza, T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, R. S. Sarthour, I. S. Oliveira, R. Lo Franco, E. R. deAzevedo, D. O. Soares-Pinto, and G. Adesso, (2015), arXiv:1511.01971.
[51] P. Skrzypczyk, A. J. Short, and S. Popescu, Nature Communications **5**, 4185 (2014).
[52] J. Åberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 150402 (2014).
[53] M. Lostaglio, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Nat. Commun. **6**, 6383 (2015).
[54] M. Lostaglio, K. Korzekwa, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 021001 (2015).
[55] K. Korzekwa, M. Lostaglio, J. Oppenheim, and D. Jennings, (2015), arXiv:1506.07875.
[56] P. Kammerlander and J. Anders, (2015), arXiv:1502.02673.
[57] G. Vacanti, C. Elouard, and A. Auffeves, (2015), arXiv:1503.01974.
[58] G. Gour, M. P. Müller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Y. Halpern, Physics Reports **583**, 1 (2015), the resource theory of informational nonequilibrium in thermodynamics.
[59] S. Lloyd, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **302**, 012037 (2011).
[60] C.-M. Li, N. Lambert, Y.-N. Chen, G.-Y. Chen, and F. Nori, Sci. Rep. **2**, 885 (2012).
[61] S. Huelga and M. Plenio, Contemporary Physics **54**, 181 (2013).
[62] V. Singh Poonia, D. Saha, and S. Ganguly, (2014), arXiv:1408.1327.
[63] A. Winter and D. Yang, (2015), arXiv:1506.07975.
[64] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
[65] D. Janzing, P. Wocjan, R. Zeier, R. Geiss, and T. Beth, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **39**, 2717 (2000).
[66] F. G. S. L. Brandão, M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, J. M. Renes, and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 250404 (2013).
[67] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, Nat. Commun. **4**, 2059 (2013).
[68] P. Ćwikliński, M. Studziński, M. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 210403 (2015).
[69] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens, Nature Communications **5**, 3821 (2014), arXiv:1404.3236.
[70] I. Marvian, R. W. Spekkens, and P. Zanardi, (2015), arXiv:1510.06474.
[71] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).
[72] V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 1619 (1998).
[73] E. P. Wigner and M. M. Yanase, Proceedings of the National Academy of Science **49**, 910 (1963).
[74] D. Pérez-García, M. M. Wolf, D. Petz, and M. B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **47**, 083506 (2006).
[75] M. Ozawa, Phys. Lett. A **268**, 158 (2000).
[76] A. Streltsov, R. Augusiak, M. Demianowicz, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 012335 (2015).
[77] M. Piani, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 034101 (2012).
[78] F. M. Paula, T. R. de Oliveira, and M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 064101 (2013).
[79] Note that quantifiers based on Schatten p-norms as defined in Eq. (8) do not give rise to coherence monotones in the sense of Baumgratz *et al*. for $p > 1$ [39]. However, this does not exclude the possibility of genuine coherence monotones based on Schatten norms.
[80] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 077902 (2001).
[81] E. Chitambar, A. Streltsov, S. Rana, M. N. Bera, G. Adesso, and M. Lewenstein, (2015), arXiv:1507.08171v1.
[82] A. Streltsov, S. Rana, M. Nath Bera, and M. Lewenstein, (2015), arXiv:1509.07456v1.
[83] E. Chitambar and M.-H. Hsieh, (2015), arXiv:1509.07458v1.